



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M-F
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,547	01/18/2002	William Ho Chang	FLEX 2233	7168
7812	7590	08/24/2006	EXAMINER	
SMITH-HILL AND BEDELL, P.C. 16100 NW CORNELL ROAD, SUITE 220 BEAVERTON, OR 97006			MILIA, MARK R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/054,547	CHANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark R. Milia	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 6/14/06 and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 1-23 and 25-30 are pending.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on 5/18/06. These drawings are acceptable. The current amendment to label Figs. 1A, 1B, 4A, and 4B as prior art and current amendment to the specification to insert reference numerals that were previously omitted has overcome the objection as cited in the previous Office Action. Therefore the objection has been withdrawn.

Specification

3. The current amendment to the specification to delete reference numeral "720" has overcome the objection as cited in the previous Office Action. Therefore the objection has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 and 25-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the current amendments to the claims and therefore a new ground(s) of rejection will be made. Newly added claim 30 will be addressed in the following rejection. The applicant asserts that Buckley does not disclose or suggest that the printer or printer server renders documents with different set of rendering parameters. The examiner respectfully disagrees as Buckley does disclose such a feature. Particularly, Buckley states that the printer driver and the virtual printer definitions may be stored in the print server and/or the printer and may be implemented in firmware and/or hardware (see column 7 lines 21-28). The virtual printer definitions include one or more sets of one or more selected rendering parameter options. The applicant also asserts that Buckley does not disclose or suggest that the general purpose computer "100" supplies intermediate output to the printer server or printers. Although Buckley does not explicitly disclose this feature, it seems to be implied based on knowledge of the art and the information disclosed by Buckley regarding the printer driver, as stated above. Further, the examiner would like to point out that the applicant admits that generating output data in PDL form from data content and sending the PDL (intermediate data) to an output device to be rasterized is prior art, as seen in Fig. 1B.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 1-14, 16, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley (US 6798530) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6020973 to Levine et al.

Regarding claim 1, Buckley discloses a data output controller method associated with a controller (print server “200”) that controls interaction between an output device and one or more information apparatus in connection with the output device rendering content accessed with the one or more information apparatus, the one or more information apparatus being distinct devices from the output devices and the controller, the method comprising: managing at the controller a communication channel with the one or more information apparatus (see Fig. 2 and column 5 lines 32-49), providing at the controller over the communication channel an output device profile associated with the output device, said output device profile enabling at least part of the content to be rasterized at the one or more information apparatus for rendering at the output device (see Figs. 1-3, column 4 lines 13-38, and column 6 lines 32-50, reference shows a memory portion “134” for storing printer definitions, which are analogous to a device profile), and receiving at the controller and over the communication channel and from the one or more information apparatus an output data that includes one or more raster output images for rendering at the output device, said one or more raster output images

corresponding to at least part of the content and being conformed at least in part with the output device profile (see Fig. 2, column 7 lines 14-20, and column 9 lines 26-36, reference shows that a user sends a document to the printer driver that is then converted into printer data and printer control data that will be used to render the image, the types of objects to be printed can be graphics, bitmaps, or text, and a mixed raster content technique can also be used, all of this is analogous to the claim limitation and is therefore anticipated by the reference).

Buckley does not disclose expressly receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus.

Levine discloses receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus (see column 7 lines 40-45).

Regarding claim 9, Buckley discloses in a computer readable medium, data output controller software associated with a controller (print server "200") that controls interaction between an output device and an information apparatus in connection with the output device rendering content accessed with the information apparatus, the information apparatus being a distinct device from the output device and the controller, the medium comprising: software for storing at least part of an output device profile (see Fig. 2 and column 6 lines 48-50), software for providing to the information apparatus and over a communication channel an output device profile associated with the output device, said output device profile enabling at least part of the content to be rasterized at the information apparatus for rendering at the output device (see Figs. 1-3, column 4 lines 13-38, and column 6 lines 32-50, reference shows a memory portion "134" for

storing printer definitions, which are analogous to a device profile), software for receiving over the communication channel and from the information apparatus an output data that includes one or more raster output images corresponding to at least part of the content for rendering at the output device, the output data received being conformed at least in part with the output device profile (see Fig. 2, column 7 lines 14-20, and column 9 lines 26-36, reference shows that a user sends a document to the printer driver that is then converted into printer data and printer control data that will be used to render the image, the types of objects to be printed can be graphics, bitmaps, or text, and a mixed raster content technique can also be used, all of this is analogous to the claim limitation and is therefore anticipated by the reference).

Buckley does not disclose expressly receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus.

Levine discloses receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus (see column 7 lines 40-45).

Regarding claim 29, Buckley discloses a data output controller method associated with a controller that controls interaction between an output device and one or more information apparatus in connection with the output device rendering content accessed with the one or more information apparatus, comprising: managing at the controller a communication channel with the one or more information apparatus (see Fig. 2 and column 5 lines 32-49), providing at the controller over the communication channel at least an indication related to one or more attributes related to the output device (see Figs. 3-5, column 4 lines 13-38, column 6 lines 32-50, column 7 lines 35-67,

and column 8 lines 61-67), and receiving at the controller and over the communication channel output data that includes at least data in a data format that is related to the one or more attributes, the output data corresponding least part of the content (see Fig. 2, column 7 lines 14-20, and column 9 lines 26-36).

Buckley does not disclose expressly receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus.

Levine discloses receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus (see column 7 lines 40-45).

Buckley & Levine are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, distribution of electronic data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the converting of image data into intermediate output data (page description language), as described Levine, and which is well known and used in the art, with the system of Buckley.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide image data in a form that contains information about printing parameters to be utilized during rendering.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine with Buckley to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 9, and 29.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Buckley further discloses performing one or more image processing operations on the one or more output images included in the output

data, the one or more image processing operations includes one or more of a color correction operation, a color matching operation, a color management operation, a scaling operation, an interpolation operation, a color space conversion, a compression operation, and halftoning operation (see Figs. 1 and 3-5, column 7 lines 35-67, and column 8 lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 3 and 11, Buckley further discloses conforming the output data into an output data that is acceptable for rendering by an output engine included in the output device (see column 7 lines 14-20).

Regarding claims 4 and 12, Levine further discloses the output device is a printing device and the method further comprising conforming the intermediate output data into a print data that is acceptable to a printer controller associated with the output device (see column 7 lines 40-47).

Regarding claim 5, Buckley further discloses delivering the output data for rendering by the output device (see Fig. 2 and column 7 lines 14-20).

Regarding claim 6, Buckley discloses further discloses wherein the communication channel includes a short-range wireless communication channel (see column 5 lines 43-49).

Regarding claim 7, Buckley further discloses providing at least part of the output device profile to the information apparatus in response to a service request received from the information apparatus (see Figs. 1 and 3-5, column 4 lines 13-38, column 6 line 51-column 7 line 3, column 7 lines 35-67, and column 8 lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 8, Buckley further discloses providing at least part of the output device profile to the information apparatus in more than one communication session with the information apparatus (see Fig. 1 and column 3 line 21-column 4 line 8).

Regarding claim 13, Buckley further discloses the output controller software is included in the output device (see Fig. 2 and column 6 lines 1-9, reference states that the system may be integrated).

Regarding claim 14, Buckley further discloses the output controller software is included in a server, an external station, a board, a card, and a data access point separate from the output device (see Fig. 2, column 5 lines 57-58, and column 7 lines 21-29).

Regarding claim 16, Levine further discloses software for implementing job management functionalities with one or more of data output job queuing and spooling (see column 10 lines 1-9).

7. Claims 17-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley (US 6798530) in view of Levine (US 6020973) and U.S. Patent No. 6493104 to Cromer et al.

Regarding claim 17, Buckley discloses in a computer readable medium, data output controller software associated with a controller that controls interaction between an output device and one or more information apparatus in connection with the output device rendering content accessed with the one or more information apparatus, comprising: software for managing a wireless communication channel with the one or

more information apparatus (see Fig. 2 and column 5 lines 32-49), software for providing over the communication channel at least an indication related to one or more attributes related to the output device (see Figs. 3-5, column 4 lines 13-38, column 6 lines 32-50, column 7 lines 35-67, and column 8 lines 61-67), and software for receiving over the communication channel output data that includes at least data in a data format that is related to the one or more attributes, the output data corresponding least part of the content (see Fig. 2, column 7 lines 14-20, and column 9 lines 26-36).

Buckley does not disclose expressly software for posting or broadcasting wirelessly the availability of the output device so that the output device can be discovered by the one or more information apparatus and receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus.

Cromer discloses software for posting or broadcasting wirelessly the availability of the output device so that the output device can be discovered by the one or more information apparatus (see column 2 line 49-column 3 line 12 and column 5 line 31-column 6 line 48).

Levine discloses receiving intermediate output data from the one or more information apparatus (see column 7 lines 40-45).

Buckley, Levine, & Cromer are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, distribution of electronic data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the wirelessly discovering an output device, as described by Cromer, and the converting of image data into intermediate output data (page

description language), as described Levine, and which is well known and used in the art, with the system of Buckley.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide image data in a form that contains information about printing parameters to be utilized during rendering. Also, wireless communications create more versatility and easier user connectivity.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine and Cromer with Buckley to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claims 18, Buckley further discloses conforming the output data into an output data that is acceptable for rendering by an output engine included in the output device (see column 7 lines 14-20).

Regarding claim 19, Buckley further discloses delivering the output data for rendering by the output device (see Fig. 2 and column 7 lines 14-20).

Regarding claim 20, Buckley further discloses software for providing over the communication channel information related to one or more of an output device identification, an intermediate output data indicator, a quality of service indicator, a price indicator, a status indicator, an output device attribute, a rasterization parameter, a format indicator, a language indicator (see Figs. 3-6 and column 4 lines 13-38).

Regarding claim 21, Buckley further discloses software for receiving output data that includes at least one output image corresponding to at least part of the content for rendering at the output device (see column 6 line 51-column 7 line 20).

Regarding claims 22, Buckley further discloses performing one or more image processing operations on the one or more output images included in the output data, the one or more image processing operations includes one or more of a color correction operation, a color matching operation, a color management operation, a scaling operation, an interpolation operation, a color space conversion, a compression operation, and halftoning operation (see Figs. 1 and 3-5, column 7 lines 35-67, and column 8 lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 23, Levine further discloses the output device is a printing device and the method further comprising conforming the intermediate output data into a print data that is acceptable to a printer controller associated with the output device (see column 7 lines 40-47).

Regarding claim 26, Levine further discloses software for implementing job management functionalities with one or more of data output job queuing and spooling (see column 10 lines 1-9).

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley and Levine as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6434535 to Kupka et al.

Buckley discloses transmitting information from the controller over a short range wireless local area network to the information apparatus (see column 5 lines 32-49).

Buckley and Levine do not disclose expressly controller software for calculating and collecting payment information as compensation for rendering of the content by the output device.

Kupka discloses software for calculating and collecting payment information as compensation for rendering of the content by the output device (see Fig. 1, column 3 line 53-column 4 line 5, column 7 line 48-column 8 line 7, and column 14 lines 3-16).

Buckley, Levine, & Kupka are combinable because they are from the same problem solving area, distribution of electronic data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the payment calculating and collect method, which is well known and used in the art, as described by Kupka with the system of Buckley and Levine.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to accurately calculate and collect payment for services rendered (data rendered).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kupka with Buckley and Levine to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

9. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley, Levine, and Cromer as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6434535 to Kupka et al.

Buckley discloses transmitting information from the controller over a short range wireless local area network to the information apparatus (see column 5 lines 32-49).

Buckley, Levine, and Cromer do not disclose expressly controller software for calculating and collecting payment information as compensation for rendering of the content by the output device.

Kupka discloses software for calculating and collecting payment information as compensation for rendering of the content by the output device (see Fig. 1, column 3 line 53-column 4 line 5, column 7 line 48-column 8 line 7, and column 14 lines 3-16).

Buckley, Levine, Cromer, & Kupka are combinable because they are from the same problem solving area, distribution of electronic data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the payment calculating and collect method, which is well known and used in the art, as described by Kupka with the system of Buckley, Levine and Cromer.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to accurately calculate and collect payment for services rendered (data rendered).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kupka with Buckley, Levine, and Cromer and Levine to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

10. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley, Levine, and Cromer as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6421748 to Lin et al.

Buckley, Levine, and Cromer does not disclose expressly (*claim 27*) software for implementing authentication procedures that limit access to the rendering provided by

the output device, and (*claim 28*) storing in a memory component an access control list specifying an information apparatus for which the output device will render content.

Lin discloses (*claim 27*) software for implementing authentication procedures that limit access to the rendering provided by the output device (see Fig. 2 and column 4 lines 26-35), and (*claim 28*) storing in a memory component an access control list specifying an information apparatus for which the output device will render content (see column 2 line 58-column 3 line 8 and column 4 lines 26-48, reference states that a user password is verified and from that a list of available output devices is displayed, thereby an output device will render content only when an information apparatus has a valid password, which is analogous to the claim limitation).

Buckley, Levine, Cromer, & Lin are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, distribution of electronic data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the posting of available output devices and authentication procedure as described by Lin, and which is well known and used in the art, with the system of Buckley, Levine, and Cromer.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been allow only certain users or workstations access to particular output devices.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lin with Buckley, Levine, and Cromer to obtain the invention as specified in claims 27 and 28.

11. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buckley and Levine as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cromer.

Buckley and Levine do not disclose expressly posting or broadcasting over the communication channel the availability of the output device so that the output device can be discovered by the one or more information apparatus.

Cromer discloses posting or broadcasting over the communication channel the availability of the output device so that the output device can be discovered by the one or more information apparatus (see column 2 line 49-column 3 line 12 and column 5 line 31-column 6 line 48).

Buckley, Levine, & Cromer are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, distribution of electronic data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the wirelessly discovering an output device, as described by Cromer, with the system of Buckley and Levine.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide image data in a form that contains information about printing parameters to be utilized during rendering. Also, wireless communications create more versatility and easier user connectivity.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Levine and Cromer with Buckley to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571) 272-7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler M. Lamb can be reached at (571) 272-7406. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark R. Milia
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

MRM



JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA
PRIMARY EXAMINER